

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Charles Kahl Stock Water Pipeline
Proposed Implementation Date:	2016
Proponent:	Charles Kahl
Location:	T13N-R57E-Sec 36
County:	Wibaux

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The Proponent has requested placing and maintaining a stock water pipeline upon state owned T13N-R57E-Sec 36. The pipeline will stem from an existing pipeline located on the south line of T13N-R57E-Sec 25. This pipeline would be installed using a static plow method and be approximately 1.25 miles in length. This pipeline should create more reliable water sources for livestock and wildlife, while creating better grazing distribution within the scope of the project. The project would include installing three tanks on this tract of trust land.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The proponent has completed the application for improvement to state land. A field review of the site was completed on August 17th 2016.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

None

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A- Approve the construction of the pipeline with installation of the water tanks.

Alternative B- No Action

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Alternative A- Some soil disturbance will occur in the area of the pipeline. This disturbance should be minimal in nature. The soils at this site are a silty/shallow complex. The proposed pipeline would be installed using a rip trench (static plow) method. All soil disturbances will be reclaimed to specifications set forth by the DNRC Eastern Land Office staff.

Alternative B- No Impact.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Alternative A- The pipeline would be fed from an existing pipeline located on the south section line of T13N-R57E-Sec 25. Effects to the available water supply should be negligible. The project should not result in any degradation of water quality.

Alternative B- No Impact

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Alternative A- Pollutants and particulates may be increased during the construction of the project. After the completion of the project pollutant and particulate levels should return to normal.

Alternative B- No Impact

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Alternative A- There may be disruption to some of the vegetation currently growing at the site. Species present on the site include Western Wheatgrass (*Agropyron smithii*), Blue Grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), Green Needlegrass (*Stipa viridula*) Needle and Thread (*Stipa comata*), Prairie Junegrass (*Koeleria pyramidata*), Bluebunch Wheatgrass (*Agropyron spicata*), Little Bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*). Vegetation disturbance should be minimal and recover naturally within 2-3 growing seasons.

Alternative B- No Impact

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Alternative A- There may be minimal disruption to the wildlife that inhabit the area. Disturbance may occur while the construction is being completed. After construction is complete and the area is reclaimed there should be minimal impact. This project will also create more reliable water sources for wildlife in the area. Bird escape devices will be installed on the stock tanks.

Alternative B- No Impact

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Alternative A- A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Program Database showed no observations of sensitive species in the general project area. Due to the small scope of this project there should not cause any significant impact to this species if present.

This project is located within Greater Sage Grouse General Habitat. Consultation with the Montana Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program has occurred (Project # 1471476031382). The program has responded with mitigation recommendations for the construction of the pipeline which will be implemented. The closest noted active lek is approximately 3.5 miles from the project area.

Alternative B- No Impact

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Alternative A- A search of the TLMS Database shows no noted historical archaeological or paleontological resources within the scope of this project. A review by ELO field staff found no significant historical or antiquity findings.

Alternative B- No Impact

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Alternative A- Noise levels may be increased slightly and temporarily during the project but will return to normal after the completion. No lasting aesthetic impacts are expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Alternative A- No impact expected

Alternative B- No Impact

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none">RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Alternative A- There may be potential safety risks for laborers but the potential risk is minimal with proper safety efforts.

Alternative B- No Impact

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

Alternative A- It would have a positive effect on Agricultural Activities and Production.

Alternative B- No Impact

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Alternative A- No impact expected.

Alternative B- No Impact

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Alternative A- No significant impact

Alternative B- No Impact

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

Alternative A- No significant impact

Alternative B- No Impact

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

Alternative A- No Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Alternative A- No impact expected

Alternative B- No Impact

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Alternative A- No Significant Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Alternative A- No Significant Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Alternative A- No Significant Impact

Alternative B- No Impact

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

Alternative A- This project would be constructed as an improvement to this tract of trust land. This project would allow for better grazing distribution and a more reliable water source for livestock and wildlife.

Alternative B- No Impact

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Scott Aye	Date: 8-30-2016
	Title: Land Program Manager	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

Alternative A

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

The granting of the requested stock water pipeline and stock tank placement on this tract of state owned trust lands for the purpose of improving grazing distribution and wildlife habitat should not result in nor cause significant environmental impacts. The proposed action satisfies the trusts fiduciary mandate by protecting the resource through improving grazing distribution and ensures the long term productivity of the land. An environmental assessment checklist is the appropriate level of analysis for the proposed action

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:☐

EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☒

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Chris Pileski
	Title: Eastern Land Office; Area Manager
Signature: /S/ Chris Pileski	Date: 8-31-2016